

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated July 20, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 6, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,544,224 (Jonsson); rejected claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of U.S. Patent 6,032,040 (Choy); and rejected claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson (or Jonsson in view of Choy where applicable).

Responsive to the grounds for these rejections, Applicants are amending all four independent claims to recite additional steps or apparatus for responding to receipt of the special indication by detecting a request from the mobile station (or the one customer in the words of claims 5 and 13) to be connected to another telecommunication station; and for controlling establishment of a connection from the mobile station (or the one customer) to another telecommunication station.

Briefly, the primary cited reference, Jonsson, teaches an arrangement wherein if a mobile customer is dissatisfied with the quality of a current mobile connection, this customer can signal to request a disconnect of the current radio connection and cause the mobile telecommunication system to attempt to establish a better radio connection. The purpose is to enhance the performance of the mobile telecommunication system in case the system is slow in recognizing a need for a handoff and in executing that handoff.

Applicants' invention relates to a totally different problem, namely, that of providing hold service to a wireless caller on an individual or a conference connection so that the caller can consult another party without letting the called party (or parties in case of a conference connection) listen to the consultation. This is a basic aspect of Applicants' invention as is shown, for example, in action blocks 205-213, 217 (Fig. 2) and 305-313, 317 (Fig. 3). While Jonsson apparently teaches disconnecting a caller from a present wireless connection, Jonsson does not teach permitting that caller to dial a number of a different called party for purposes such as consultation and then coming back to the original connection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the amended independent claims should be held allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants are canceling claims 2, 6, 10 and 14 because their subject matter is redundant with the amended independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 13.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the grounds for rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, and 15-16 as amended, allow the application including these claims as amended, and pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner feels that a voice or fax communication would help to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call or fax Applicants' attorney at 630 469-3575.

Respectfully submitted

S. C. Goss et al.



by Werner Ulrich  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 30810

Date: Oct. 11, 2004